

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 648

SO 018 415

AUTHOR Norton, Robert F.
TITLE A Comparison of Thinking and Writing Patterns in Korea and the United States. AFS Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning No. 12.
INSTITUTION AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jul 87
NOTE 23p.; Summarized from "A Comparative Analysis of Korean and American Writing Styles as Expressed in Expository Essays," unpublished doctoral dissertation by Robert F. Norton.
AVAILABLE FROM AFS Center for the Study of Intercultural Learning, 313 East 43rd Street, New York, NY 10017.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Processes; Comparative Analysis; *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Differences; Cultural Influences; Cultural Traits; International Education; *Writing (Composition); *Writing Processes; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS *Korea; *Pattern Analysis

ABSTRACT

Major writing style differences between Korean and U.S. essayists are examined in order to determine: (1) the types of relationships expressed in a specific essay; (2) the sequence in which related ideas are expressed; and (3) the distance between two ideas that comprise each relationship. Eighteen basic types of relationships were examined in essays selected from both cultures on topics in the general subject areas of nature, philosophy, and customs. Each idea in an essay was compared to every other idea in it in order to identify relationships. Results indicated that U.S. essayists tended to use general-to-specific sequences, while Korean essayists constructed sequences which moved from specific-to-general. This may account for difficulties authors from both of these cultures encounter when attempting to write materials for the other culture. The study concluded that U.S. essayists tend to be deductive writers, while Korean authors tend to organize materials inductively and that sequence, not type, of relationship may account for the major differences in expression modes in different cultures. Tables are included. (JHP)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE OF AFS INTERNATIONAL

AFS volunteers and professional staff throughout the world are moving towards the goal of peace by stimulating an awareness of mankind's common humanity, a wider understanding of the diverse cultures of the world, and a concern for the global issues confronting society. They acknowledge that peace is a dynamic concept threatened by injustices both between and within nations.

In pursuit of this goal, the core of the AFS experience has been the promotion of relationships in which families, communities, groups and maturing young persons from different cultural backgrounds share new learning situations related to the purposes of AFS. In addition, through experience and experimentation, AFS has developed and continues to encourage new models and opportunities for exchange that will be beneficial for the development of society.

AFS does not affiliate with any religious, political or partisan group, but it believes in the value of participating in a continuous process of interaction between cultures both across and within boundaries.

AFS encourages all participants to involve themselves in situations in which they can apply and project their AFS experience.

INTRODUCTION

We realize that you have not received an Occasional Paper for more than six months, and we apologize. But this, our twelfth issue, has been worth the wait. Our author, Dr. Robert F. Norton, is intimately familiar with a few of the regions of the world that, at the time we are going to press, many of us would identify as centers of crisis. In the following pages, he shares some insights regarding why people from two specific cultures might not be able to comprehend each other's written communications, notwithstanding a shared language (the second language of one of the two groups) and the best of intentions.

Following his childhood in Ogden, Utah, Robert F. Norton received his bachelors degree from Brigham Young University, after which, in 1970, he entered the Peace Corps. After serving the customary two years as a Peace Corps volunteer, at Jeonbuk National University in Jeonju, Korea, he signed on for a third year, which he spent at Kyung Hee University in Seoul. This Occasional Paper relates some of his experiences, including problems in communicating with English-speaking Koreans, during these three years in Korea; these experiences led to his doctoral dissertation research (which brought him back to Korea briefly in 1975 and again in 1978). He returned to the United States and, in 1978, completed his Ph.D. at Brigham Young University. But before that year was out, Dr. Norton was working in Kuwait as an educational research and evaluation specialist. In 1979, he went to work in Jordan as an assistant professor of educational psychology. Then, in 1982, Dr. Norton became an assistant professor of cognitive psychology at the American University of Beirut, Lebanon. Because of the civil strife in Beirut, he returned to the United States in 1985. Dr. Norton currently is a research and evaluation specialist carrying out studies of multiple cultures at Brigham Young University.

Dr. Norton is married to Dr. Elizabeth J. Norton, a clinical psychologist. They have two children. David was born in Jordan. Nadia Alexandra was born in Beirut on the day of the worst fighting ever in the university area. (The Norton family was evacuated five days later by helicopter.) On that day, one of Robert Norton's students, Nadine Kuhn, was killed while trying to make her way home. Nadia Alexandra is named after Nadine. The root of both Nadia and Nadine means "hope."

A COMPARISON OF THINKING AND WRITING PATTERNS
IN KOREA AND THE UNITED STATES

Robert F. Norton

Increasingly, people are confronted with the situation of being face-to-face with a person from a different culture to whom they need to communicate an urgent message; often, however, they come away terribly discouraged by their inability to do so. When the backgrounds of the two individuals are very different, or sometimes even when they appear to be similar, a fundamental difference in thinking style might be central to the problem. But people rarely if ever consider difference in thinking style to be a potential problem. Many are prone to assume that everyone else thinks in exactly the same way that they do.

Anyone who has taught and lived in the Orient for any length of time is acutely aware of the great difficulty that Oriental students have in communicating their ideas in English, especially in written form. This difficulty in communication does not seem to be as acute during face-to-face contact, perhaps because of nonverbal cues that help to convey meaning or perhaps because face-to-face interaction allows both participants to ask questions when they don't quite understand a particular point that the other is trying to make.

Teachers of English as a second language have often been puzzled by the fact that students from the Orient (China, Korea, and Japan) can often master the grammatical structures of English quite rapidly, but seem to have more difficulty learning to write essays in English than do native students in most non-English-speaking Western European nations. The difficulty of the Oriental students seems to indicate that something isn't being communicated in their classrooms that is essential for them to master English writing techniques. What is this something? How can it be characterized?

Translators, when attempting to translate from Eastern Asian languages into English, have similar problems in trying to produce an English counterpart that is as intelligible to native English-speakers as the original is to native Orientals. The difficulty is especially acute if the translation is very literal, which seems to indicate that there is a difference between English and Eastern Asian languages that is broader than the syntactical (grammatical) issues that are usually treated in language and translation classes. This difference seems to be related to the way in which the ideas are joined together to produce written discourse. If they knew the exact nature of these differences, translators might be enabled to produce more intelligible translations. In addition, language teachers might be enabled to teach English essay writing more effectively.

How I Came to Study Korean and American Discourse Patterns

After living and teaching English for three years in Korea as a Peace Corps volunteer, I was greatly perplexed by the inability of my students to communicate their thoughts to me in written English when we seemed to do so well communicating with each other face to face. It is true that I knew Korean to some extent. I lived with Korean families or roommates during most of my stay in Korea and could communicate in Korean well enough to shop for food, to greet friends and neighbors when we met on the street, and to engage in simple conversation. However, whenever we had something deeper to talk about we generally found that their English was better than my Korean.

Koreans have a word, nunchi, for being able to communicate with each other without saying much. Literally, it means being able to communicate through the eyes. Many of my friends and I marveled that I seemed to have it, because my Korean was really not very good. We did communicate very well and we got very close to each other -- just as close if not closer than I was to my closest boyhood friends back in the United States. When I think about it now, I am convinced that nunchi comes more from being a member of a close circle of friends than it comes from being able to communicate directly through the eyes. It comes from losing yourself and your individual identity in total commitment to the group and the group's goals. There is a very beautiful feeling of warmth and security involved that is difficult to explain to someone who has not experienced it.

I was excited to find that both articles in the *Occasional Paper in Intercultural Learning* Number 11 (December 1986) mentioned the preëminence of the group in China as well. Deborah Leonard's comment that "the heroes of the New China are those who unquestioningly sacrifice themselves for others, not individuals who are daring enough or enterprising enough to go against the current to pave their own way" (p. 5) is also descriptive of the loyalty of friends to each other in Korea. Often we in the West tend to criticize Orientals for their group loyalties, but we should remember that the idea of sacrificing one's own interests for the good of others is very much a part of the "Christianity" that is supposed to be the core of our Judeo-Christian tradition. It is significant that Ms. Leonard's students felt that "the preëminence of the individual" is both the best and the worst aspect of Romanticism. Hundreds of years ago, Confucius gave what is probably still the best solution to the dilemma of striving for individual freedom and maintaining group loyalties: "Keep to the middle road."

In the same number of the *Occasional Papers*, Hu Wenzhong (p. 13) mentioned the lack of a concept of privacy as being characteristic of China. Absence of privacy is also typical of Korean culture, where it is very much a part of the preëminence of the group. I found that the intimacy of being part of the group in Korea was much more valuable

than trying to hold onto the advantages of privacy. In the United States I had become accustomed to having a room to myself, absolute silence when I needed to study, and total darkness when I wanted to sleep. But such luxuries were not possible when sharing a room no bigger than many bathrooms in the United States with the three oldest sons of a Korean family -- each with a different exam schedule that required someone keeping the light on until the wee hours of the morning to study almost every night of the week. But it didn't take long to get used to the inconvenience. And there was something special about knowing literally everything about each other. If one of us was feeling troubled about something, he didn't have to mention anything about it, because the rest of us already knew and we knew exactly what he needed to make him feel better.

One of the most beautiful aspects of this group loyalty is the feeling of love and respect for each other that permeates the extended family. There is not really a concept of cousin in Korea because children of all the father's brothers are regarded as brothers and sisters and are referred to as such. Children of any of the father's brothers are welcome to eat and spend the night at any of the brothers' homes without prior notice and this privilege is often extended to anyone from the child's circle of friends. Furthermore, the way old people are revered and cared for by their children and their children's children is much more edifying to the elderly than putting them in the care of a nursing home, as we often do in the West.

This same group identity is very important in Japan as well, and in no way seems to be detrimental to getting ahead in the business world. It is very much related to being able to steer a middle course between extremes, and people in the East seem to be more adept at this than we are in the West. Dr. Takeo Doi, Professor of Mental Health at the University of Tokyo and one of Japan's leading psychiatrists, has given the most thorough description of this feeling of belonging to the group that I have been able to find. He links it to the Japanese concept of amae -- the feeling of passive love that all normal infants at the breast have towards their mothers, which is somehow prolonged by the Japanese culture to extend throughout the life of the individual and which influences his attitude toward other people (Doi, 1973).*

This feeling of closeness of Koreans, Chinese, and Japanese toward their inner circle of friends and family members permeates their thinking and likely contributes to what has been characterized as their indirect manner of expressing their thoughts. What can be communicated through nunchi when facing another individual who belongs

* Editors' note: The amae concept also is discussed in Occasional Paper in Intercultural Learning Number 5, entitled "Cultural Adjustment Difficulties of Japanese Adolescents Sojourning in the U.S.A.," by Elizabeth Ann Hartung.

to your intimate circle of friends, and what can be communicated to members of your own culture via written language, are somehow lost on the cold surface of a page written for someone of a different culture.

After I returned to the United States in December of 1973, I couldn't stop thinking about how brilliantly insightful my Korean friends had been when we were living together, yet how incomprehensible I found the written compositions that they had turned into me as assignments. The letters they sent to me as a friend after I was back in the States were much more understandable than the compositions they had submitted to me when I was their teacher. Yet I knew that many more hours of careful thought had gone into their incomprehensible compositions than had gone into their hastily scribbled yet much more readily understood letters. When the time came to select a topic for my doctoral dissertation in Instructional Psychology, this apparent difference in thinking styles seemed like a very good subject to try to understand. But how could it be done?

I had already begun to look for anything I could find comparing the thinking styles of different cultures. There were many ways of comparing syntax or grammar differences between languages, but these differences didn't seem to be particularly relevant to the questions that I wanted to ask. Some of my students in Korea could compose flawless English sentences, but their compositions, to my way of thinking, remained incoherent and unorganized. The sentence seemed too small a unit to study in an effort to gain an understanding of what was "wrong" with their compositions as a whole.

I also began to examine various methods of analyzing and comparing written materials. I soon became convinced that comparisons at the discourse level are the only ones likely to make possible a characterization of culturally based differences in thinking styles. Many linguists maintain that discourse, which involves the interrelationships of sentences and paragraphs, is concerned basically with what goes on in the writer's mind. So by studying writing style differences, especially at the discourse level, I expected to be able to infer differences between Korean and American thinking styles.

The doctoral study I eventually chose was designed to characterize the major writing style (that is, thinking style) differences at the discourse level between Korean and English. Although there are different types of written discourse, I decided to narrow the scope of my study by looking only at expository essays. Expository essays are designed primarily to explain or describe a particular subject matter, which serves as the main focus of the essay. I selected this type of discourse because there are numerous examples of it in both languages and because expository essays are usually shorter and more compact than other types of discourse. I also elected not to look at the writing of students, who often only approximate what is recognized as good writing in both cultures, but to look instead at essays by famous authors who were recognized by scholars in each culture as being

outstanding writers. Finally, I decided to examine each author in the original language rather than resorting to mere translations of the Korean essays or writings of Koreans in English.

There are several different techniques for discourse analysis that have been used over the last 20 years. They have been developed primarily for looking at English discourse and have not been applied extensively to other languages. Writing in English has often been characterized as based almost entirely on a deductive thought pattern such as that characteristic of Aristotelian logic: In this pattern, one properly begins with a general topic sentence and then systematically restricts its meaning by presenting more specific details at several levels of generality -- proceeding from the most general to the least general. The following diagram of the last paragraph of "The Bee," by Mark Twain, illustrates this deductive pattern as well as the meaning of different levels of generality:

- 1 After the queen, the personage next in importance in the hive is the virgin.
- 2 The virgins are fifty thousand or one hundred thousand in number,
- 2 and they are the workers, the laborers.
- 3 No work is done, in the hive or out of it, save by them.
- 4 The males do not work,
- 4 the queen does no work,
- 5 unless laying is work,
- 5 but it does not seem so to me.
- 6 There are only two million of them [eggs to be laid], anyway,
- 6 and all of five months
- 7 to finish the contract in.

The level-designations, as they progress from 1 (1st) to 7 (7th), denote a decrease in the degree of generality and a corresponding increase in the degree of specificity. (It probably would be better to call them levels of specificity rather than levels of generality. However, I chose to conform to the convention in linguistics.) This consistent progression from the most general to the least general in a more or less straight line is what linguists and others have called **linearity**.

The relationship between two ideas at different levels of generality is usually referred to as a **restrictive relationship**, which means that the idea designated by the larger number is more specific than the idea designated by the smaller number, or, conversely, that the idea designated by the smaller number is more general than the idea designated by the larger number. For example, in the preceding diagram, the two level 2 generalities ("the virgins are fifty thousand or one hundred thousand in number" and "they are the

workers, the laborers") each elaborate a detail about the virgin bees mentioned in the level 1 generality, or topic sentence ("after the queen, the personage next in importance in the hive is the virgin"). These two ideas are therefore restrictively related to (that is, more specific than) the level 1 generality. The level 3 generality in a similar manner restricts the meaning of the level 2 generality under which it falls, and so forth.

The relationship between two ideas at the same level of generality is usually referred to as a coordinate relationship and means that the two ideas are equally specific and can be subsumed under the same more general statement to which they are both restrictively related. For example, the two level 2 generalities mentioned above are coordinately related to each other. "The virgins are fifty thousand or one hundred thousand in number" and "they are the workers, the laborers" do not elaborate or restrict the meaning of each other, but they both do elaborate or give more detail about the level 1 generality that precedes them.

Although some scholars speak of an inductive format (moving from specific details to generalities) in Western thinking, paragraphs illustrating this thought pattern are very difficult to find in written English. Even the relatively few paragraphs that seem on the surface to have an inductive format (specific to general) seem to revert back to the deductive format (general to specific) to provide more details about their major elements.

From my relatively limited exposure before beginning this study to Korean writing (mostly to translations into English and English compositions written by native Korean students), I noticed that the deductive pattern is not as prevalent as it is in American writing. There are often no topic sentences at all in Korean writing, so that the text seems to ramble quite freely from one idea to the next. I did not bring back with me any of the compositions written by my own students -- not knowing then that I would later be writing my dissertation on such a topic -- but this rambling style is well illustrated by the following paragraph written as a class exercise by a Korean student cited by Robert Kaplan (1966, p. 10):

Definition of College Education

College is an institution of an higher learning that gives degrees. All of us needed culture and education in life, if no education to us, we should to go living hell.

One of the greatest causes that while other animals have remained as they first man alone has made such rapid progress is has learned about civilization.

The improvement of the highest civilization is in order to education up-to-date.

So college education is very important thing which we don't need mention about it.

This free rambling from one idea to the next may be a signal that Oriental writing is the product of a system of logic that is not deductive.

My problem was to find a technique for analyzing Korean discourse that was not linked to the deductive pattern of English writing. Most techniques of discourse analysis were developed for studying English writing and are so closely tied to the deductive pattern of Western writing that they are of limited usefulness in analyzing non-deductive writing. A technique developed by Willis L. Pitkin (1973, 1975, 1976, 1977) was the only major technique I was able to find that is far enough removed from the deductive pattern to be useful in characterizing the Oriental pattern.

Pitkin's analysis focuses primarily on whether the second idea of each set of two adjacent ideas is more specific in meaning than the first, more general than the first, or of equal specificity. Pitkin's approach will reveal the deductive pattern in English, Korean, or any other discourse wherever there is a sequence of two ideas that moves from the relatively general to the relatively specific. In such a case, linearity would appear just as it did in the sample paragraph from Mark Twain's writing. However, if successive ideas were not related to each other by being repeatedly more specific than the ones before, the linear, deductive pattern would not emerge.

Pitkin also listed a number of relationships, other than that associated with degree of specificity, that are possible between ideas adjacent to one another in a written text. Halladay and Hasan (1976) compiled a similar list of possible relationships. The technique for discourse analysis that I eventually used was initially derived from a combination of these two listings and was modified, extended, and refined as my study progressed. A detailed description of the technique I actually used is presented in my dissertation (Norton, 1978).

My Procedure for Comparing Korean and American Discourse Patterns

In characterizing the major writing-style differences between Korean and American essayists, I decided to restrict my study to an analysis of the following three aspects of discourse: (1) the types of relationships expressed in the essay, (2) the sequence (or order) in which the related ideas are expressed, and (3) the distance between the two ideas that make up each relationship (how much intervening material occurs between them). Eighteen basic types of relationships were examined along with eleven possible sequences.

There are a number of factors other than culture (Korean versus

American) that could conceivably affect the writing style of essayists both from the same culture and from different cultures. Steps were taken to control for these factors to get as pure a measure of cultural differences as possible. I was able to identify at least 14 non-cultural factors. These included such personal attributes of the essayist as maturity, sex, and personality; such social characteristics as social class, economic status, educational level, occupation, and knowledge of other languages; and such other circumstances as the region within the country from which the essayist came, the climate of that region, and the historical time period. These factors also included such characteristics of the essay as its topic and the purpose for which the essay was written.

The essayists and the essays analyzed were selected in a manner that enabled me to retain some control over the non-cultural factors so that I could better isolate the influence on the discourse patterns of the cultural factors. A pool of Korean essays was selected by native Koreans as being well written and typical of Korean expository essays. Then a search was made among the writings of noted American essayists for essays dealing with the same or similar topics so that subject matter could be minimized as a cause of observed writing style differences. Furthermore, the Korean and American essayists were matched according to as many of the other factors mentioned above as possible. The exact procedures I used for matching on each variable are elaborated in my dissertation.

The essays selected for comparative analysis are listed by topic, culture, title, and essayist in Table 1 (following page). The Korean essayists marked by an asterisk (*) are those essayists who have had considerable training in English and may be considered bilingual.

Each of the essays was analyzed according to the three aspects of discourse mentioned earlier: relationship type, relationship sequence, and distance between related ideas. Then each idea was compared with every other idea in the essay to identify the relationship between them. As mentioned earlier, 18 types of relationships were identified. Almost every idea in a particular essay was found to be related to at least one other idea in the same essay by at least one of the 18 relationships. The total number of each type of relationship was counted as well as the total number of all relationships in each essay. The percentage of each type of relationship relative to the total number of relationships served as the measure of the relationship-type aspect of discourse.

The restrictive (general to specific, specific to general) and coordinate types of relationships were the most commonly found ones linking ideas in both the Korean and American essays; the different ways of expressing such relationships seem to account for most of the differences in discourse patterns between the American and Korean cultures. Examples of these two types of relationships have already been provided in the Mark Twain paragraph above. Examples of each of the other types of relationships are given in my doctoral dissertation.

Table 1. Essays by Topic, Culture, Title, and Essayist (bilingual essayists are marked with an asterisk)			
<u>NATURE:</u>			
	(1) <u>Spring</u>		
Korean:	"Spring"	*Pi Chun Deuk	
American:	"Spring"	Henry David Thoreau	
	(2) <u>Trees</u>		
Korean:	"Tree"	*Lee Yang Ha	
American:	"The Wild Apple"	Henry David Thoreau	
	(3) <u>Bees, Flowers</u>		
Korean:	"Rose of Sharon"	*Lee Yang Ha	
American:	"The Bee"	Mark Twain	
<u>PHILOSOPHY:</u>			
Korean:	"The Philosophy of Living Man"	Kim Jin Sup	
American:	"Philosophy and the Education of Man"	John Dewey	
<u>CUSTOMS:</u>			
Korean:	"On Top Knots"	Yang Joo Dong	
American:	"Gifts"	Ralph Waldo Emerson	

Only the sequences related to the restrictive relationship type will be discussed here because they were by far the most pervasive for both Korean and American essays. When two ideas are related restrictively, either the general idea or the specific idea may be presented first. An example of the general to specific sequence, which turned out to be the most prevalent in English, is provided by the Mark Twain paragraph diagrammed earlier. An example of the specific to general sequence, which turned out to be the most prevalent in Korean, is provided by the passage by Lee Yang Ha near the end of this paper. Examples of the other sequences can be found in my dissertation. The percentage of usage for each sequence was calculated in a manner similar to that used for the relationship-type aspect.

The distance between ideas related by the various relationship

types was analyzed on the basis of the amount of intervening material between the two ideas of a particular relationship.

Each of the essays was analyzed by me in the original language. Because of my inadequacies with respect to written Korean, I used at least two and usually three translations of each essay (made by native Koreans) to assist me in deciding on the best interpretation of each passage. Each translation consisted of two parts: (1) a word-by-word translation of the English written directly under each character of the original and (2) a free translation to capture in grammatical English the same meaning as the original. Whenever a disagreement could not be resolved by my own knowledge of Korean or by a dictionary, the Korean instructor at Brigham Young University was consulted for his interpretation.

Because of the length of time and technical skill required to analyze a single essay, it was not feasible to have two independent analyzers examine each essay. However, to get a measure of the reliability of the technique, one essay from each culture was independently analyzed by a native, upper-level graduate student (at Brigham Young University) trained in linguistics. Each analysis was compared with my analysis of the same essay to get a measure of inter-rater reliability. For the 309 relationships identified from "The Bee" by Mark Twain, there was an agreement of better than 90%, and for the 268 relationships identified from "Tree" by Lee Yang Ha, there was an agreement of better than 80%.

What I Found When I Compared the Two Styles of Discourse

Table 2 (following page) displays the average percentages of the restrictive and coordinate relationships, as found in the American and Korean expository essays that I investigated.

The most striking result of the relationship-type analysis is that over 50% of the relationships identified for both cultures are either restrictive or coordinate relationships: 22.7% restrictive and 28.1% coordinate for the American essayists and 27.1% restrictive and 24.5% coordinate for the Korean essayists. This is especially significant when we take into consideration the fact that I used a conservative analysis technique which tended to minimize the number of such relationships counted. None of the other 16 relationship types that I examined in the study even came close to either of these two types in frequency of usage. Furthermore, the percentage of both the restrictive and coordinate relationship types is surprisingly similar. What is even more surprising is that the essayists from both cultures were found to use essentially the same percentages of most of the other 16 types of relationships as well. Apparently the same fundamental relationships between ideas are basic to communication in both the Korean and American cultures. It may very well be that they are basic to communication in all cultures. This is important to examine further.

Table 2. Average Percentages of Restrictive and Coordinate Relationships Used by Matched Korean and American Essayists

TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP	PERCENTAGE BY CULTURE	
	American	Korean
Restrictive (specific-general, general-specific)	22.7	27.1
Coordinate	28.1	24.5
Percentage totals	50.8	51.6

My relationship-sequence analysis provided the information most relevant to our major concern: the organizational pattern of written American thought versus that of written Korean thought. The average percentages of the two restrictive relationship sequences used by each culture are recorded in Table 3 (following page).

Note that American essayists used almost exclusively the general-to-specific sequence, while Korean essayists used almost exclusively the specific-to-general sequence. This difference between Korean and American essayists was found to be highly significant (when statistical tests were applied) and may account for much of the difficulty that writers from each culture have when trying to write for the other culture. (There were also other sequence differences that were found to be significant, but these were for relationships that were not nearly so pervasive in these essays as the restrictive type.)

When analyzing the third aspect of discourse, distance between related ideas, I had the feeling that there was a greater amount of extraneous material between related ideas in the Korean essays than in the American ones. However, I now feel that this apparent difference can be better explained in terms of the results of the relationship-sequence analysis. I will discuss the reason for this later.

It is true that there are several instances of gigantic leaps in the train of thought in the Korean essays. However, there are such leaps in the American essays as well. For example, in "The Bee," Twain begins the essay by relating that Maeterlinck introduced him to the bee, then in paragraph two he introduces the term bee scientist. He proceeds thereafter describing the bee for six paragraphs before jumping back to Maeterlinck, who (we find out from the next paragraph) is probably a bee scientist. He continues to talk about bee scientists for three more paragraphs before finally jumping back to his train of thought on bees for a long concluding paragraph.

Table 3. Average Percentages of the Two Types of Restrictive Sequence Used by Matched Korean and American Essayists

TYPE OF RESTRICTIVE SEQUENCE	PERCENTAGE BY CULTURE	
	American	Korean
General to Specific	18.7	5.1
Specific to General	4.0	22.0

I had originally predicted that American essayists are deductive writers, using mostly restrictive and coordinate relationships in an overall general-to-specific sequence, whereas Korean essays are more likely to use a non-deductive, non-linear approach to writing that involves primarily other types of relationships and sequences. My findings clearly give support to this prediction and to the widely held notion that English is basically a deductively organized language, for in the American essays the proportion of restrictive and coordinate relationships predominated and the percentage of general-to-specific restrictive sequences (characteristic of deductive organization) was much higher than the corresponding percentage of specific-to-general sequences. Furthermore, the prediction that Korean essayists are not deductive writers is equally well substantiated by the higher percentages of specific-to-general sequences found for them among the restrictive relationships.

It is fairly obvious from the predominance of specific-to-general sequences in the Korean essays that Korean writers tend to be inductively organized. I had no idea when I began my study that such a pattern, directly opposite to that of American writers, would be found. Each of the Korean essays analyzed is most strongly characterized by the inductive (specific-to-general) sequence, while its counterpart among the American essays is contrastingly characterized by the deductive (general-to-specific) sequences -- that is, in every essay except "The Wild Apple" by Thoreau. The individual essayist percentages for the two restrictive sequences are presented in Table 4 (following page; asterisk denotes Thoreau's essay).

This means, then, that the prediction about Korean being "non-linear" must be incorrect, for an inductive sequence is every bit as linear as a deductive one but merely moves in the opposite direction. Because these essays are allegedly typical of most other Korean essays, this inductive organizational pattern is likely to be characteristic of most Korean writing.

It seems strange that such a dominant feature of the Korean

Table 4. Percentage of Use of the Two Types of Restrictive Sequence by Individual Korean and American Essayists

TOPIC	GENERAL TO SPECIFIC		SPECIFIC TO GENERAL	
	American	Korean	American	Korean
Spring	15.8	7.3	0.9	21.4
Trees	15.1	5.1	16.0*	16.6
Bee/Flower	20.4	4.9	1.0	23.7
Philosophy	24.6	2.9	1.2	38.0
Customs	17.4	4.2	0.8	10.4

organizational pattern was not noticed and described previously. However, when we consider the mind-set that is established by the strongly deductive pattern of English, it is easy to understand how an inductive pattern could be difficult to notice. When one has become accustomed to having virtually all coordinate and more specific ideas presented after a general topic sentence -- that is, after a type of relationship indicator that prepares the mind to relate the ideas in a certain way -- it is little wonder that such ideas, when presented without the topic sentence, seem to be unrelated and disconnected. When one is used to finding the relationship indicator **before** the ideas that it mutually relates, one's mind may be hopelessly lost when the relationship indicator doesn't come until the end. Furthermore, by the time one finally gets to the relationship indicator within an inductive pattern, one may have already forgotten the ideas that the indicator is supposed to mutually relate.

Some Practical Applications of My Findings

It is probable that some of the other relationship-type differences uncovered by this study contribute to miscommunication problems between the two cultures as well. However, since the restrictive and coordinate relationships already discussed seem to make up such a large percentage of the total organization structure, it is feasible that, by being alert to only these relationship sequences, one can make considerable headway toward producing a legible translation of many Korean literary works. Pointing out these differences in organizational patterns also could be very helpful in helping newly arriving foreign students to express themselves in writing in a way that is more understandable to native Americans. Such awareness should help Americans trying to communicate with Koreans as well.

How useful such an approach could be might best be illustrated by

introducing a portion of one of the Korean essays analyzed in the study and systematically rearranging it from its inductive pattern to a more deductive one that is therefore compatible with American expectations. The following paragraph is quoted verbatim from one of the translations that I used to assist me in the analysis of "Rose of Sharon" by Lee Yang Ha. Although most of the internal sentence structure has already been rearranged by the translator to be fairly understandable in English, the overriding inductive structure remains and makes it difficult for an American to follow in a single reading.

The flowers are shy, indirect and modest. But they have not less self-confidence. The reason is that every blossom, one by one, is wilted and withered up during the night after it has begun to blossom, but the routine to open new flowers keeps on until August, September, and October. It blossoms continuously up to the time we feel white-cotton-trouser-and-jacket chilly in the morning and in the evening. If we count the blossoms to open and be withered during the period, how many thousands or how many ten thousands of blossoms there will be, I wonder? The period in which the flowers blossom most flourishingly is in the middle of August. At this time there are several hundreds of blossoms on the tree that is as high as I am. Our fathers, who had thought it the greatest happiness on the earth to thrive brothers and sisters, the posterity to succeed sons and grandsons from a hundred generations to a thousand generations, might have loved the rose of Sharon for the first reason as above. On the other hand, as for the flowers, it would be evaluated as a virtue as much as they are prosperous like this, as long as they last like this. For the [above] reasons, our fathers also might have loved the rose of Sharon and loved its being modest and accessible.

The intent of Lee Yang Ha in this section of "Rose of Sharon" is to explain the two main reasons why the founding fathers of Korea loved the rose of Sharon enough to select it as the Korean national flower. Notice that the less important of the two main reasons -- that it blooms for such a long season -- is presented first. We are not told, however, until the last sentence that this is only one reason why the founding fathers selected it as the national flower. The main reason -- because the rose of Sharon produces so many blossoms -- follows the lesser reason, and the statement that this is indeed the main reason follows even later.

Notice how much easier the passage is to understand if the order of the sentences is rearranged (and a few other minor changes in the wording are introduced) in order to render the train of thought into a more deductive pattern:

[Roses of Sharon] would be evaluated as a virtue as much as they are prosperous like this: Our fathers, who had thought it the greatest happiness of the earth to thrive brothers and sisters and have much posterity to succeed them as sons and grandsons from a hundred generations to a thousand generations, loved the rose of Sharon mainly because of how many blossoms it bears in a single season. If we count the blossoms to open and be withered during the period, how many thousands or how many tens of thousands of blossoms will there be, I wonder? The period in which the flowers blossom most flourishingly is in the middle of August. At this time there are several hundreds of blossoms on the tree that is as high as I am. For the [following] reasons, our fathers also might have loved the rose of Sharon and loved its being modest and accessible as long as they last like this: It blossoms continuously up to the time we feel white-cotton-trouser-and-jacket chilly in the morning and in the evening. The flowers are shy, indirect and modest. But they have not less self-confidence. The reason is that every blossom, one by one, is wilted and withered up during the night after it has begun to blossom, but the routine to open new flowers keeps on until August, September, and October.

The same technique that I used to transform the original, inductive and (to the American mind) seemingly rambling structure into a deductive pattern, could easily be used by translators of Korean writing to make their translations more understandable to an American audience -- whenever understanding the content is considered to be of major importance. Likewise, Korean students coming to study in the United States could be directed by their English teachers to write their compositions in Korean just as they have always done. Then, when translating them into English before turning them in, they could work from the end of their essay to the beginning. Proceeding in this way should greatly help them to approximate more closely the pattern that has become accepted in the United States. Eventually, as the American pattern becomes more habitual, the Korean students could try to write their assignments directly in English.

In a similar manner, translators going from (American) English writing into Korean could proceed in an analogous fashion from the end to the beginning of the English version to produce the inductive pattern more acceptable in Korea. The important thing to remember is to put the important (the most general) ideas at the beginning for Americans and at the end for Koreans.

This advice is an oversimplification, of course, since there are other types of relationships that are expressed in essays besides the restrictive and coordinate ones. These other relationships also have their preferred sequences in the two different cultures. But since

the restrictive and coordinate relationships seem to be so pervasive in both cultures, much of the difficulty in communicating might be overcome by this relatively simple strategy. Similar strategies could be developed for the other types of relationships as their directional sequences become identified more completely.

Some Additional Thoughts Generated by My Study

One of the most interesting insights gained from my study is that, although the essayists came from two very different cultures, they still tended to use the same kinds of relationships to express their thoughts and, amazingly, even used the same proportions of most of the various relationship types. It seems quite likely that the same fundamental relationships may be basic to communication in all cultures, with the restrictive and coordinate relationships being the most abundant. Sequence -- not type -- of relationship may account for the major differences in modes of expression in different cultures.

Korean has many similarities with Chinese and Japanese, especially in the early written forms of these languages. All three languages originally used the same ideographic characters, which undoubtedly has had an important influence on the modes of expression of the people from these three cultures. All Korean scholarly works were written in Chinese characters until the overthrow of the monarchy by the Japanese around the turn of the century; today Chinese characters are still used extensively even in newspapers. Therefore, I would expect to find many similarities in Korean and Chinese, and very probably also in Japanese, discourse patterns.

The following observation by Carolyn Matalene (1985) about the importance of memorization and attention to form in China applies equally well to Korea and is consistent with the inductive pattern that seems to be so pervasive in Korean expository essays:

To be indirect in both spoken and written discourse, to expect the audience to infer meanings rather than to have them spelled out, is a defining characteristic of Chinese rhetoric and one that, like the emphasis on memorization, is consistent with the nature of the language. The Chinese written language is ideographic, pictorial, concrete; from the characters on the page the reader must synthesize, infer, and "create the text." (p. 801)

The nature of the written language clearly requires extraordinary feats of memorization as well as extraordinary attention to form -- the expert calligrapher follows rules for making each stroke within each character. . . . Certainly the prescriptions of the written language ultimately affected social practices, and there emerged a

cultural phenomenon which made memorization and formalism the defining attributes of intelligence: the Chinese examination system. (pp. 796-97)

Matalene goes on to elaborate how the Chinese examination system has been used for 13 centuries in China to select members of the civil service, the most honorable and influential career that a scholar could pursue. Memorizing the classics and composing poems and essays according to the traditional forms became prerequisites for membership in the governing elite. Boys between the ages of 8 and 15 were required to learn by heart **The Four Books** and **The Five Classics** of the Confucian canon, which contain over four hundred thousand characters. Such a task, at a rate of two hundred characters of text a day, requires about six years of memorizing.

Memorization and attention to form are also very important in Korea. Certainly the inductive form of communication requires a much greater capacity for remembering than does the deductive form, for one must remember all of the seemingly unconnected details until the generality that subsumes them is finally presented at the end of the paragraph or at the end of the discourse. Koreans, Japanese, and Chinese are experts in the art of memory.

I think it would be very productive to conduct similar studies on other types of Korean writing to see whether the inductive pattern is as pervasive as the present study suggests. It also would be useful to carry out such studies on a number of diverse languages to see whether further evidence is forthcoming for the psychic unity of mankind in terms of the types of relationships used to connect ideas. Furthermore, it might be useful to determine how many different types of sequence people in various parts of the world have found for systematically linking ideas so that they can communicate effectively with each other. I would be happy to collaborate with anyone working in other cultures who is interested in using the discourse analysis approach to try to identify the thinking or organizational patterns of other language systems.

Suggested citation:

Norton, Robert F. "A Comparison of Thinking and Writing Patterns in Korea and the United States." **Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning**, No. 12 (July 1987). New York: AFS International/Intercultural Programs.

References

- Doi, T. (1977) The Anatomy of Independence. Tokyo: Kodansha International, Ltd.
- Halladay, M.A.K., and Hasan, R. (1976) Cohesion in English. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Hu, W. (1986) "Why Bother about Culture in English Language Teaching?" Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning, No. 11. New York: AFS International/Intercultural Programs.
- Kaplan, R.B. (1966) "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education" Language Learning, Vol. 16, No. 1 & 2. pp. 1-20
- Leonard, D. (1986) "A Walking Footnote: Teaching American and English Literature to Chinese Students." Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning, No. 11. New York: AFS International/Intercultural Programs.
- Matalene, C. (1985) "Contrastive Rhetoric: An American Writing Teacher in China." College English, Vol. 47, No. 8. pp. 789-808.
- Norton, R.F. (1978) A Contrastive Analysis of Korean and American Writing Styles as Expressed in Expository Essays. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University.
- Pitkin, W.L., Jr. (1973) A Pedagogical Model of Discourse Structure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Pitkin, W.L., Jr. (1975) X/Y: Writing Two Steps at a Time. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Department of English.
- Pitkin, W.L., Jr. (1976) X/Y: Some Basic Strategies of Discourse. Logan, Utah: Utah State University.
- Pitkin, W.L., Jr. (1977) "Hierarchies and the Discourse Hierarchy." College English, Vol. 38. pp. 648-72.

[0866d on disk 0017d]

OCCASIONAL PAPERS IN INTERCULTURAL LEARNING

is a publication of

AFS International/Intercultural Programs, Inc.
313 East 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017, USA

Editor: Dr. Neal Grove

Associate Editor: Dr. Bettina Hansel

AFS International publishes the *Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning* as a public service, and for this reason the articles contained in the *Papers* are not copyrighted unless a specific notice to the contrary is provided. Articles printed herein without copyright notice may be quoted or reprinted without permission; however, proper attribution should be given and the Editors of the *Papers* informed.

Potential contributors should communicate with the Editors prior to submitting articles to be considered for publication in the *Papers*.

Beginning with Number 10, which appeared early in 1986, the *Papers* were put on a subscription basis for those wishing to receive them at addresses within the United States. (No subscription or back-issue fee is charged to anyone receiving the *Papers* at an address outside of the United States.) The subscription system operates as follows:

- Subscriptions are for five issues, which are published over a period of approximately two years. These subscription cycles are projected to cover 1986-1987, 1988-1989, 1990-1991, and so forth. Note that subscription fees will be received only during the early months of the first year within each two-year cycle.
- In order to minimize bookkeeping, no subscription fee will be charged to those who begin receiving the *Papers* within any two-year cycle; these new recipients will be asked to subscribe at the beginning of the next regularly occurring subscription cycle.
- Back issues of the *Papers*, from Number 1 (June 1982) through the most recently published issue, will be sold to requesters at addresses within the United States at \$1.50 per copy. Checks or money orders should be made payable to "AFS International"; no purchase orders, please. Note that a specific back issue may not be available at any given time.

ISSN 8756-9078